tensively in the Far East. His was a unique journey. First, he paid for the trip himself. It was unique for another reason also. I believe it has now been generally conceded that in his travels he, as a notable American citizen, dedicated himself to improving amity and happy relations between the people of the United States and those of the countries of the Far East which he visited.

The labors of our distinguished Hawaiian colleague were the basis of a commendatory resolution adopted by the Republican State Central Committee of the State of Hawaii at its meeting on November 7, 1959, in Hilo. A copy of it was transmitted to the Vice President of the United States by Mr. Merson L. Skinner, of the State central committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the body of the RECORD.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am delighted to yield to the able junior Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I was in the Far East during the time our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] was there. I did not encounter him there, but I did, on all sides, hear what a great ambassador of good will he was for our country. The fact that HIRAM FONG is of Chinese ancestry and is now serving in the Senate of the United States obviously meant much to the peoples of the Far East, who sometimes may feel that our ties are closer to other countries than to them.

I feel certain that the trip by Senator HIRAM FONG to the Far East will yield rich dividends to our country. I am very happy that the able senior Senator from California has brought this resolution to our attention.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from the Empire State. What the junior Senator from New York has just stated is that the citizenship of this country, which is heterogeneous in character, is able to demonstrate to all mankind that we do believe in constitutional freedom and in equal treatment under law.

As the able Senator from New York has said, the Senator from Hawaii, by reason of his background, has been in a unique situation to advance the cause of freedom.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me on that point?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, many of us, as is true of the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the very able former Governor of California, Hon. Earl Warren, who first appointed him to the Senate, and who is now the Chief Justice of the United States, and others who have long supported statehood for Hawaii, have come to the conclusion that it was more important for the United States to grant statehood to Hawaii than for Hawaii to receive statehood. I believe the United States is more the beneficiary of the act of admitting Hawaii as a State of the Union than is Hawaii itself.

Except for spiritual gain, embodied in the glorious acquisition of full first-class citizenship, the people of Hawaii have gained in no material way, have in no measure changed their economic status by statehood; but by admitting Hawaii to statehood the United States has demonstrated something that rings to the farthest corners of the earth. It was a peaceable shot heard 'round the world.

It was very heartening to us who supported Hawaii's statehood cause and followed what took place thereafter, to observe that, regardless of party, the five principal candidates who were successful in the Hawaiian election represented five totally diverse ethnic strains.

Governor Quinn is of American-Irish descent; Senator Long is of American-Anglo-Saxon descent; Senator Fong is of American-Chinese descent; Representative Inouye is of American-Japanese descent; and Jimmy Kalealoha, elected Lieutenant Governor, is of American-Polynesian descent. They constitute a typical cross-section of Hawaii's population and a proof of its ethnic democracy.

I think the United States is fortunate in this development and in the fact that the visits of Senator FONG and Representative INOUYE to the Orient as messengers of good-will and living embodiments of our democracy have brought great returns to Uncle Sam in better and truer understanding of what our Nation stands for.

I wish to commend what the senior Senator from California and the junior Senator from New York have just said on the question. I am happy to associate myself with their views.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, that is a worthwhile contribution from a splendid American and a great Senator. I thank him for it.

I believe the fact that the admission of Hawaii as the 50th State of this great Union is something in which we can take a great deal more pride and joy than the people of Hawaii themselves can take.

Mr. GRUENING. That is my view.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Honorable HIRAM L. FONG, has been traveling at his own expense through the countries of the Orient; and

Whereas the favorable reaction of the people of these Pacific basin countries has been so uniformly favorable and has resulted in a much friendlier understanding between these countries and ours: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Republican Party of Hawaii proudly commends the Honorable HIRAM L. FONG for the unselfish devotion to his duties as a U.S. Senator representing the State of Hawaii.

VISIT BY SENATOR MUSKIE, OF MAINE, TO POLAND

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, at the conclusion of the investigation which a special Senate subcommittee had undertaken of Russia's development of its vast hydroelectric resources, the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], a member of the subcommittee, on his way home, stopped off in Poland. It was his purpose to find the village from which his father had emigrated 59 years before. He wanted to visit his father's birthplace and the graves of his paternal ancestors and, if possible, to find any relative who might still be alive.

On his return he recounted his experience in a news release. In my view, and in that of others who have read Senator MUSKIE's moving account, our beloved colleague from Maine has made a memorable contribution to that enduring literature which embodies the heart and soul of the American idea. It reemphasizes the utterance, some years ago, of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, that once all Americans were immigrants. But beyond that, Senator MUSKIE's release makes vivid that we, the descendants of immigrants to America, must be eternally grateful to our fathers and forefathers who had the vision and the initiative to leave the old world and seek freedom and greater opportunity in the new.

Sometimes it would appear that some of our fellow citizens whose pioneering ancestors many generations ago courageously embarked on an uncharted course and left the old world, with its restrictions, rigidities, oppressions and inequalities, may have, to a degree, lost that passion for and understanding of what their forefathers envisioned and sought. But to those whose personal experiences and recollections of what America meant to our forebears are still fresh—the first, second, and perhaps even the third generation of immigrants—EDMUND MUSKIE's message of renewal carries a special significance and poignancy.

I ask unanimous consent that our colleague's inspired narrative be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the newsletter by Senator MUSKIE was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As I record this I am sitting at my desk at home, relaxed and thoroughly enjoying the American way of life after 35 days away from it. It has been good for me personally to be exposed to the people and the customs and the intellectual, political, and economic climate of the Soviet Union. The experience highlighted those values which make America such a wonderful place in which to live and intensified my appreciation of them. I hope and believe that the experience will be of real value in connection with my duties as a U.S. Senator.

By fortuitous circumstances, Clayton LaVerdiere, of the Waterville Morning Sentinel, arranged with Jane to use excerpts from my letters to her as a report to the citizens of Maine on my travels. I hope they proved of interest. They could not possibly constitute a comprehensive report of all our new experiences and impressions. In particular

We would do well to decide, first of all, that life is much more kind to people in a land of plenty. To know freedom from hunger and cold should be counted as a blessing and not a cross to bear.

No sound-thinking person believes that we can ever achieve an exactly balanced program of production-to-need. Then isn't it better that the balance be on the side of abundance and that we do have a reasonable food bank to insure against hunger?

And should we not apply business thinking and write off the cost of that insured security as we might car, life or fire insurance?

But surpluses beyond reason do present a real challenge. What have we done about them? Not enough, surely.

The National Farmers Union has long advocated a unit measure of bushels—tons, etc., rather than heavily fertilized acres as the proper measure for production quotas, and a broadening of the basics. It has also asked for a definite dollar and cent limitation on price supports to any one producer.

The purpose for both:

(1) to discourage over-production; (2) to stop channeling so much acreage into the few protected crops; (3) to prevent undue individual benefits.

To date Congress, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the national administration have all failed to take a firm stand.

Senator NEUBERGER's proposed food for peace plan, calling for the use of surpluses to feed the hungry peoples of the world certainly has merit. (Incidentally, I was pleased to note the Oregon Farmer's support for this suggestion.) To date we have seemingly preferred to send money and munitions, writing the cost off to national security. Would not food to the hungry create equal good will—and much less suspicion? And wouldn't that be a living demonstration of international humanitarianism and also a contribution to national security?

Likewise, the Oregon Wheat League is to be commended for its excellent work in the field of expanding uses of surplus commodities.

FOOD STAMP FUTURE

The food stamp plan, embodied in a bill by Senator WAYNE MORSE, could also well meet a domestic need and present both a saving and an outlet. With our abundance of food, why have we hesitated so long? Surely we would not seriously disrupt our trade economy by supplying food we cannot sell to those who have no money to buy.

The school lunch program has been an excellent example, not only of food distribution to the right people, but of food promotion. Teachers and those who do the actual contact work in the schools can tell of the increased taste for milk and vegetables so necessary to young growing bodies. (Just think what the brewing industry would give for such an opportunity.)

These programs should become more universal. They will certainly show long-range dividends in national health.

THE SOIL BANK IDEA

The soil bank idea, based on the theory that it is better to store fertility against future needs than to store excess surpluses makes sense. As enacted into law, it has been badly abused but the necessary teeth have now been added.

Many people find it difficult to reconcile the soil bank program with the activities of the reclamation service in bringing in new acres, or with the USDA's regular requests for more money for research for increased yields—to realize the hope of 100-bushels-per-acre wheat, for example. Or with the USDA's advice to further mechanize and to apply expensive fertilizers in greater abundance.

The advice is theirs and I leave the answer to them.

EIGHTY-PERCENT PROSPERITY

Most discussions and articles on the farm problem, particularly if they come from departments which live by legislative appropriations, avoid the mater of what farmers actually receive for their production.

The critics are often more inclined to describe glowingly the growth of vertical integration and the glories of expanded farm operations. In their enthusiasm they temporarily forget what is happening to the countless thousands of farm families without farms that most surely go hand in hand with the growth of vertical integration, contract farming and the decrease of market opportunities.

When the ills of the shrinking farm dollars are discussed they are often cheerfully blamed onto the fickle fancies of the consumer whose changing demands increase cost.

No one denies the changes, but let us look at this last one carefully and put part of the blame where it properly belongs.

The manufacturers, processors, and distributors who do fancy packaging and costly duplication in a competitive struggle to capture more and more of the profit in the consumer's dollar must also share responsibility.

It was not consumers who demanded five name brand bread deliveries at the corner grocery—and of loaves costing 30 cents plus and containing some 3 cents worth of wheat each, for example.

Nor was it you and I who asked for atomic age fishfin fenders and double-jointed tail lights that sent the cost of cars, repairs, and insurance to new heights.

It is well past the time that economists and farm advisers, including our own U.S. Department of Agriculture, need to become farm price conscious. It is time we all join in better acquainting the consuming public with what part of the dollar the farmer actually receives for his commodity at the farm.

Those who would advise should know that there are many young farmers today who face near bankruptcy in a losing struggle. It takes more than efficiency to pay for expensive modern farm machinery at a 100 percent plus parity price with farm commodities sold on an 80 percent of parity market.

It is time to come down to earth and realize that any farmer, regardless of size or volume or efficiency, who produces and markets a commodity at less than the cost of production has about as much chance as a woodpecker above timberline to share in the national prosperity.

It is a small and doubtful honor to be able to prove that by efficiency you were the farmer in your community who lost the least.

PEOPLE ARE IMPORTANT

Sometimes I wonder if in our zest to deal with statistics and in our eagerness to enthuse about bigness, we haven't forgotten the human factor that gives all others purpose—the people themselves.

Enough has been said in recent years to inform everyone that the farms of this Nation and the families that live on them are becoming fewer and fewer.

Always, and properly, there has been a constant and voluntary departure of members of farm families to enter other fields, to find employment.

Recently, however, that trend has become an exodus, and certainly not all voluntary. Nor are they all young, employable people. We are informed that about 75 percent of our young people today leave the land, and that about 50 percent of them are working today in organized labor.

Certainly we cannot hold this against them. They are our children. We have done our best to teach them the value of organization. We know that if labor today was as loosely organized as farmers, laborers too would be working for an 80 percent of parity paycheck.

Labor rallied well to meet the revolution of automation in industry by demanding—and receiving—better wages and shorter hours. We as farmers met the challenge of mechanization by producing more and more for less and less.

REWARD FOR EFFICIENCY

We seek no protective wall around inefficiency. Efficiency, good management, and industry are entitled to their just rewards. We know some people will prosper more than others in any vocation.

But many farmers would still remain upon the land, knowing that their economic returns would be a little lower than if they went to the city. They are following a chosen way of life and they would willingly exchange the opportunity to "eat a little higher on the hog" for the many fine intangible benefits of family life on the farm.

But this does not mean that these people should be crowded off into migrant labor status by an unfair economic setup. They are entitled to a fair price for their production. These family farm people are truly the salt of the earth. They believe in the land and what it can do. They live on, and from, the soil, in a partnership with God and nature. If democracy is ever put to the test for final existence, it is here in these country homes that its roots will be found most deeply imbedded and where it will live the longest.

LET'S SUM THIS UP

Freedom from hunger and cold is a blessing. We had best recognize it as such and write off its costs as we would any other sound insurance program.

Excessive surpluses are a challenge but can be made manageable by a varied attack. Production must be controlled to reasonably meet the needs of the day. But production should be limited by intelligent controls—not by ruinous prices.

Any farm program that does not plan for an equitable price for commodities to the producer renders little economic service to American agriculture.

People are important. They should come neither last nor least. They create the problems and the necessity for answers. Any solution that allows human values to become submerged in economic issues has missed its basic purpose.

FARM INCOME DOWN

Net farm income nationally for the first three quarters of 1959 was down sharply from the similar period of 1958, according to the USDA's current farm income situation report. (And many weren't getting rich in 1958.)

Income for the first 9 months of 1959 was reported as approximately $11,500 million; this was $1,500 million under the 1958 period—a decline of 12 percent. However, it was still 4½ percent above the recession year of 1957.

This year's January-August total of cash receipts from livestock and products was 4 percent less than last year's. Although prices averaged higher for cattle, they were substantially lower for hogs, broilers, and eggs.

Total crop receipts in the first 8 months of 1959, however, were reported as about the same as 1958. Receipts from corn, oranges, and tobacco were up considerably, but they were offset by a sharp drop in receipts from sorghum, grain, and wheat.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR FONG OF HAWAII

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last fall the distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], traveled ex-

avoided detailed discussion relative to our primary mission, that of evaluating the status and pace of hydroelectric power developments in the U.S.S.R. There is much material to be digested and analyzed in proper perspective before the subcommittee, and its staff will state firm conclusions or consider recommendations. There is no question, however, as to the very considerable momentum which the Soviet Union has developed in this field.

My letters to Jane did not touch upon my 2 days in Poland, it being obvious that I would reach home before any letters which I might write from Warsaw. Yesterday, October 26, for example, my fourth day at home, Jane received a letter which I wrote in Leningrad on October 15th. Airmail has not yet caught up with the jet age. Apparently, also, it takes a little longer for mail to pierce the Iron Curtain.

As you know, my father was born in Poland. He left it 59 years ago at the age of 17 in search of freedom and opportunity. He found both, not only for himself, but also for his children, and for that we will be eternally grateful. At the same time, he always spoke to us warmly of his homeland, its loveliness, and the scenes of his childhood.

Remote as the possibility seemed, I wanted to find the village where he was born, in order that I might trod in his name the soil to which he never found it possible to return in his lifetime. I found it. A tiny rural village called Jasionowka, 20-odd miles north of Bialystok, not too far from the Russian border, at what was described to me by Deputy Foreign Minister Winiewicz as the saddest part of Poland.

To reach it, Frank and Mrs. Jones, of the American Embassy, and I drove 75 miles northeasterly from Warsaw. The main roads in Poland are excellent and we made good time—thoroughly enjoying the flat but pleasant and attractive countryside and the mild and sunny autumn day. As we approached the village, we passed, of all coincidences, a lake with a familiar name, Augusta. At this point, I became profoundly moved as I considered in a matter of minutes my eyes would see fields, streams, and trees and possibly even faces that my father's eyes had seen last more than half a century before.

We had left the main road and were driving over a narrow, cobbled country road. As we topped a slight rise, there came into view in the distance a large white building, somewhat shabby, but clinging to the shreds of an ancient dignity which I instinctively felt must be the manor house of a nobleman's estate which my grandfather had maanged at the turn of the century. And so it proved to be, now converted to a state farm with a new barn, some battered older buildings, ruins of others and a small duck pond which may have been a favorite spot for children in my father's day. A short distance beyond, the pitiful, unpainted, weather-beaten homes of the villagers were clustered about a broad square, dominated by the stately white church which my father attended.

In sharp contrast to the Soviet Union, the Poles are devout in their belief in God and extremely conscientious in discharging their religious duties. It was heartwarming to see them swarming to the church on Sunday morning, walking, on bicycles, or in spotless wagons, behind their horses. Their extremely difficult economic and political circumstances seem simply to strengthen their faith in God's purposes.

With little more than an hour at my disposal, my first objective was to find some trace of my father's family. We proceeded to the local presidium and almost immediately located a friendly girl who recalled an old lady bearing the family name. She escorted us to a drab little house on one of the side streets. We knocked on the door and entered. In a dark little cubby hole of a kitchen, I met the widow of my father's brother, tiny and stooped under the weight of almost 80 years. With her was my father's niece, herself a widow with a young child, her husband killed in the war, having grasped the almost incomprehensible fact of my identity, my cousin quickly showed me pictures of my father and my mother which he had sent her long years ago and letters he had written. They did not know of his death and accepted his silence over the past 3 years as just another of the burdens which filled their daily lives. The sister my father left behind is also dead, leaving three sons who were away at work and unavailable during my visit. I met the wife of one of them, whose first question related to the possibility of coming to America.

At this point, the local grapevine had spread the word and the street in front of the little house swarmed with villagers. They were obviously delighted to welcome me and wanted to know all about me and my family. A surveillance team had picked us up on the border of Bialystok Province and followed us. The villagers were highly amused when these two representatives of the state police rather shamefacedly refused my invitation to pose for pictures, which I said I wanted to show the Deputy Foreign Minister when I met him that afternoon.

It is difficult to comprehend the economic circumstances of the people in that little village—the bareness of their lives. They have no meat; they stand in line for bread. Their diet appears to consist of potatoes and cabbage. The monthly wage is roughly the equivalent of $10 to $20. Their personal possessions are almost unbelievably meager. This is indeed the saddest part of Poland. But for my father's dream of freedom and opportunity this would be my life—the life of my children.

And what of the people who live this life? They have courage. They have their belief, and their faith in God. They value friendship, and love, and family ties, and derive such happiness as they know from these. Sadly, however, they have no hope that their lot will be improved, and the result is a deep apathy which stifles ambition and interest in the public issues which will shape their future.

Poland is a country in an almost hopeless political and economic dilemma. Its people historically have cherished independence and freedom and love of country above all else. Geographically today they find themselves in such proximity to the Russian colossus that like the turtle, they are forced to withdraw into the shell of their obvious security alliances. Were they free to do otherwise, their hearts and their traditions would take them elsewhere.

Economically, following the war, the Russians, in their own interests, developed an industrial complex in Poland, notably steel and textiles, which make the country almost irrevocably committed to the Soviet Union for the necessary raw materials. It must rely upon coal and agriculture for the exports to balance its international payment, and its agricultural lands are fragmentized into small holdings which are committed to ancient unmechanized methods and practices which fall far short of the production necessary to meet domestic needs and export requirements. These current difficulties, which I have probably oversimplified for sake of brevity, plus centuries of living in the crossroads of war in Eastern Europe, have made my father's village what it is today.

The past and the present have created a far different, more comfortable, and better world for me than they have for my cousins.

Must this be?

What does the future hold?

We speak constantly of a just peace. We pray for it. And what would a just peace mean to my cousins? And there are many, many more millions in the world, living in circumstances no better and, indeed, far worse than they.

Before I left the village, I visited the cemetery in search of my grandparents' graves. There was no trace. As is so often the case in Europe, they are probably at rest two or three layers deep. People have lived, died, for many, many centuries in this part of the world, some with their grinding misery and their fleeting happiness, some with flaming hopes, and others with forlorn hopelessness; some with lives of abundance and others with lives of emptiness.

Europe is an ancient civilization. We are an outgrowth of it, and out of this deep past, its lessons and experience as well as its aspirations, we seek the promise of a brighter future for all mankind. Can we find it? May God will it so.

As we drove away from the village, I caught a last glimpse of the white church, gleaming as it shed its shabbiness in the sunlight and the distance. Suddenly and hauntingly, I felt myself to be the second generation bearer of the dream of freedom and opportunity which prompted my father to leave his home behind him. This is 10:45 p.m. Tbilisi time, or 2:45 p.m. Washington time.

A LONG OVERDUE MEMORIAL TO TEDDY ROOSEVELT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this morning it was my honor to have my picture taken before the bust of Vice President—and later President—Theodore Roosevelt, which is located on the principal floor of the Senate wing of the Capitol. My companion for the photograph was Vice President NIXON.

It is fitting that Vice President NIXON, who exemplifies many of the fine qualities of Teddy Roosevelt, should be in the forefront of the effort to establish a suitable memorial to that great leader. In pursuit of this goal, the Vice President today sent the following letter to every Member of Congress:

Enclosed is a copy of the final report of the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission. We feel that a great deal was accomplished during the year-long observance of the anniversary of Theodore Roosevelt's birth and that we were able to achieve most, if not all, of the objectives laid down by the law which created the Commission.

Let me call your attention to page 47 of the report, however, and to that one major aim which yet awaits action, namely, the completion of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial in Washington.

You may recall that the Theodore Roosevelt Association, 30 years ago, presented Theodore Roosevelt Island, a 90-acre tract in the Potomac, to the American people for the establishment of a suitable memorial. A bill calling for an appropriation of $886,400 for the construction of this memorial is now before the Congress. When it has been approved, this tribute to one of our most distinguished Presidents will be well on its way to realization.

The legislation referred to will come before the Congress for action during the coming session. It is the sincere hope of the members of the Commission that you may lend your support to the creation of this memorial to one of our great American Presidents.

Yours sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

As a cosponsor of Senate bill 2561, which seeks to provide for the construction of a Theodore Roosevelt memorial on Theodore Roosevelt Island, in the

Potomac River, I am pleased to have this strong backing for a memorial to one of New York's most illustrious sons. Suitable homage from the Nation to which he contributed so much is long overdue, and I am hopeful that in this session of Congress final passage of this measure will be achieved, so that work on the memorial can proceed without further delay.

In this connection, the incomparable Bess Furman, of the New York Times, this fall penned a most interesting article concerning plans for the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial. I ask unanimous consent to have Miss Furman's article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 29, 1959]

WASHINGTON PLANS FOR ROOSEVELT (T.R.) ISLAND

(By Bess Furman)

WASHINGTON.—Three important structural developments close together, involving the Potomac shore and Theodore Roosevelt Island in the river, are destined to change the face of this Capital City in the area between the Lincoln Memorial and Georgetown, upstream.

These are the proposed Constitution Avenue Bridge, a continuation of Constitution Avenue crossing Theodore Roosevelt Island to the Virginia side, thus seeking to relieve downtown Washington's heavy traffic congestion; the striking National Cultural Center, to rise beside the river at the foot of New Hampshire Avenue between the proposed bridge and the mouth of Rock Creek, facing out toward the beautiful wooded island; and the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial. The bridge is to be built on the island, now a bird sanctuary and free of all human habitation.

The bill to construct the three-tiered bridge with its complex approach system seems sure to pass Congress at its next session. The bill will give access to the island and make it one of Washington's showplaces. The memorial will be visible from the bridge.

The cultural center's design, by the New York architect Edward D. Stone, includes an opera house to seat from 3,000 to 4,000; a concert hall, to seat 3,000; a theater of 1,000 to 1,800 capacity, and two smaller auditoriums for plays and lectures. It is to cost $61 million.

As for the memorial project, Theodore Roosevelt Island, about a mile long and half a mile wide, has been the subject of several previous acts of Congress.

TERMS OF BILL

The bill now pending provides "that the Secretary of the Interior shall erect on Roosevelt Island such monument or memorial to the memory of Theodore Roosevelt, and related structures, as may be approved by the Theodore Roosevelt Association, the Commission of Fine Arts, and the National Capital Planning Commission." It would authorize appropriation of such sums as may be necessary.

For legislation of modest cost—about $500,000—it could not have more distinguished backing. In the House, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Democrat, of Texas, lent his prestige by being photographed with the architect's drawing of the memorial and its chief sponsors, RICHARD M. SIMPSON, Republican, of Pennsylvania, and LEO O'BRIEN, Democrat, of New York. In the Senate, Minority Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, joined with New York's two Senators, JACOB K. JAVITS and KENNETH KEATING, as sponsors.

When completed, the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial will be a blood brother to Rockefeller Center, for it was Paul Manship, the sculptor of the statue of Prometheus there, who conceived the large bronze celestial sphere that will be the principal feature of the memorial. The sphere will be about 40 feet in diameter and about 60 feet high.

BAS RELIEF

At the center of the granite base on which it is to rest there will be a bas relief of Theodore Roosevelt. The sphere, placed beside a reflecting pool, will be at the center of a court 150 feet wide and 200 feet deep, bordered by trees. On 12 granite panels, each 10 feet high and 20 feet wide, spaced on three sides of the court, will be carved Theodore Roosevelt's most famous statements on government. Eric Gugler is the architect.

Erection of the memorial will carry out plans formulated about a quarter of a century ago. These can now be put in effect, because Congress has finally decided where it will put the new bridge. On the island, however, anyone wishing to commune with the spirit of Theodore Roosevelt will have to do so on foot. In honor of that nature lover, only foot trails are allowed there. In any case, the island has had a colorful history.

The Indians, of course, were there first, giving it the name spelled with quaint variations on early maps—"Anticostan," "Analostan," "Anacostien," and later "Analostan," a name it held until the Hoover administration. When the colonies were formed, it was called "My Lord's Island," for it belonged to Lord Baltimore.

In 1717 it was bought by George Mason, the father of the father of the Bill of Rights. It descended to the famous George, the master of Gunston Hall, who willed it to his son, John Mason. The island was a possession of the wealthy and powerful Virginia family for 125 years. So it was "Mason's I." on the maps of early Washington, in which it was included.

The island's most glamorous period began in the 1790's when the building of the Federal city was being started. When John Mason inherited it from his father in 1792, he already was the leading banker of Georgetown, had a monopoly on the ferry to the Virginia shore and possessed large business and property interests in the District of Columbia.

FRENCH PLAN

He had spent much time in Paris looking after the Mason family overseas shipping interests and he envisaged the island as one of those well-barbered rural retreats popular in France. That was the way in which he developed it. The handsome home he erected at its highest spot, commanding a view of building operations at the White House and the Capitol, has been attributed in its design to George Hadfield, one of the early architects of the Capitol.

The Mason home in its heyday was described by David Baillie Warden, British consul at Georgetown in 1810, in a book published in Paris in 1816.

"Its interior is finished in costly style by its opulent owner," wrote Warden. "The garden is kept in fine order, ornamental trees, shrubs, and rare plants are a source of attraction to botanists."

He described servants' quarters, summerhouses, flora and fauna. He said the snapping turtles grew so big that when General Mason threw one of them in his canoe, "it attacked him so furiously he was obliged to leap into the water." Large turtle eggs, he said, were a staple of diet.

Looking riverward from a summerhouse, he narrated, "We perceive the sails only as if by enchantment gliding through the trees."

HOST TO THE GREAT

John Mason entertained the great men of his time, including Louis Philippe, later King of France, at his island home. A central hall connected the ornamental front stoop and formal back terrace, with a drawing room on one side of the hall and, on the other, a dining room that opened into a bedroom wing, beneath which were basement kitchens and a wine cellar.

It was in this home in 1797 that James Murray Mason was born. He later became a cause célèbre in the Civil War when he was sent with John Slidell by President Jefferson Davis of the Confederacy to negotiate with Great Britain—only to be captured by a U.S. naval vessel and detained for some time at Boston before being allowed to resume his journey to Europe.

It was in January 1805, that Congress passed its first act concerning Analostan Island, a move destined to be disastrous both to Georgetown and the Mason family. It provided that Georgetown would be permitted to build a causeway from the island to the Virginia shore to expedite the stage route and to improve the navigation of the river by diverting the main flow of Little River, along the Virginia shore, to the District of Columbia side of the river.

The city of Georgetown had no intention of building this combined dam and causeway, which was, in fact, a private enterprise project by the owner of the stage line, John Mason. On July 1, 1805, a legal paper was drawn up through which Georgetown empowered Mason to build the causeway 30 feet wide and 8 feet above high tide. It was to be "secured by parapet walls 4 feet high above the top of the dam or base of the said road made thereon."

One local historian has declared that this causeway "caused a gradual filling in of the channel and contributed to the decline of the town (Georgetown) as a seaport." Another noted: "The marshes created by the causeway brought swarms of mosquitoes which rendered the island uninhabitable and the Masons eventually quit it." The fine house went to rack and ruin. Then, in 1869, it suffered a devastating fire.

Meantime, floods washed out the Mason causeway, the mosquito blight abated and colorful events were resumed on the island under various auspices and ownerships. On July 4, 1834, there was a balloon ascension from the island, seen by between 6,000 and 7,000 people. In the 1850's, Mayor William A. Bradley was host there at lavish picnics.

PONTOON BRIDGE

Early in the Civil War, it was said to have served as a Confederate recruiting office. Later, Union forces threw a pontoon bridge across to it, and Mathew B. Brady took a picture to prove it. Hardly was the war over when an annual custom of crowning a Queen of Love and Beauty was initiated. Harper's Weekly of October 7, 1865, describes, with elaborate sketches, the crowning, the tilting of the ring that preceded it, and the dancing in the moonlight that followed.

In the 1880's the Columbia Athletic Club operated the island as a race track and ball field. In the early nineties a sprinter set a record for the 100-yard dash there. In August of 1907, the whole place was almost sold for $100,000 to a New York amusement company to create a new "Coney Island." On January 8, 1932, the Roosevelt Memorial Association bought it from the Washington Gas Light Co., which had planned to use it commercially. The memorial association then offered it to the Nation as a shrine.

Again there was an act of Congress—that of May 31, 1932—accepting the gift and changing the name to Roosevelt Island. The deed was presented to President Herbert Hoover in ceremonies at the White House on December 13, 1932. Already Franklin D. Roosevelt had been elected President. In January 1933, Congress acted once more, making it Theodore Roosevelt Island to clarify for all time which President Roosevelt was being memorialized.